

**From:** Daly, Eric [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BF6AD94E11314203826E63C8DF0511E2-DALY, ERIC]  
**Sent:** 12/28/2015 3:26:56 PM  
**To:** Bernard Nwosu (Ben.Nwosu@WestonSolutions.com) [Ben.Nwosu@WestonSolutions.com]  
**Subject:** Is there anything else on our "to do" list?

Hi Ben:

Is there anything else on our "to do" list? This is my email to Lyndsey. You did receive the PRG values for CRU, correct? The numbers used for SSAL...

**CRU:**

1. We need to give Dan a more detailed recommendation on what to do as far as assessment (survey & soil sampling)
2. CRU: Site-specific action level for radiological parameters (For Weston. I sent Ben the list of PRG info from the slideshow)

**NFB:**

1. We need to calculate shielding using same principals as CRU slideshow. If we have the amount of shielding needed, we can estimate overall costs (Material, labor, travel, etc.) to install the shielding for the whole property of concern and just for the parking lot. We will use Wolff as a guide. If the shielding consists of less layers, than it would be slightly less for materials (not so much time and labor). If the shielding required is thicker, than we know it will be more than Wolff. Unless you have a better idea.
2. Power Point for NFB/HTC for January 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting.
3. The Action Memo (attached) needs your blessing. I am not sure after we talked if you review as is or you have some error you discovered (internal versus external?). I was hoping to have an excavation only action memo ready to go and then if we need to revise based on the shielding option or shielding/excavation option or fencing shielding option....we will.

**HTC:**

1. Site-specific action level for Bi-210, Pb-210, and Th-234, which were not included in the list received (**Lyndsey will need to comment on this**)

**For all three Sites:**

1. Do we have an action level for aqueous matrix (pg. 3 of the table)? **This question is for all the sites. We will require site-specific action levels for each site. This will most likely be addressed next week.**
2. Please can you write a sentence explaining why the swipe sample locations were biased towards assess doors?
3. Swipe sample locations Niagara Falls Blvd and Holy Trinity (**I provided this last week**) Oleg compared wipe results for the Moffat Street Site with the following statement: "These levels are below 100 dpm and 1,000 dpm, respectively, outlined in New York

**City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYC DOHMH) Article 175 of the NYC Health Code, "Radiation Control", §175.03 - Release of Materials or Facilities." Do you intend to consider this for the rest of the NY Rad sites? See Attachment E. This will most likely be addressed next week.**

4. I have not received your decision regarding EPA standards to compare with TAL Metals + mercury analytical results. This will most likely be addressed next week.

Regards,

Eric

"We must, indeed, all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately", Benjamin Franklin

Eric M. Daly

On-Scene Coordinator/Radiological Response Specialist

US Environmental Protection Agency- Region II

ERRD/RPB/PPS

2890 Woodbridge Avenue

Edison, NJ 08837

[daly.eric@epa.gov](mailto:daly.eric@epa.gov)

732-321-4350